

CONNIE STEELMAN, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
vs. ) Case No. 4:12CV00185 AGF  
)  
CITY OF SALEM, )  
)  
Defendant. )

This matter is before the Court on Defendant’s motion (Doc. No. 24) to strike Plaintiff’s motion (Doc. No. 23) requesting “. . . all of Defendant’s council, to comply with COURTS LAWS OF ASSERTIVENESS, and NOT HARASSMENT.” Defendant notes and the Court agrees that apart from this statement, Plaintiff offers no specific information regarding the allegedly objectionable nature of counsel’s conduct. In addition, Plaintiff has not filed a response to Defendant’s motion to strike and the time to do so has expired. Therefore, the Court finds no basis for granting either Plaintiff’s motion for unspecified relief or Defendant’s motion to strike Plaintiff’s motion.


Also before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Inasmuch as the filing fee in this action has been paid, there is no reason to grant Plaintiff such status and the motion will be denied as moot.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Court is **DENIED**. (Doc. No. 23.)

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Motion to Court is **DENIED as moot**. (Doc. No. 24.)

**IT IS FINALLY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* is **DENIED as moot**. (Doc. No. 25.)

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Audrey G. Fleissig", is written over a horizontal line.

AUDREY G. FLEISSIG  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 5th day of October, 2012.